



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,993	01/20/2001	Suresh Madhavan	M-8770 US	1210
22918	7590	10/21/2005		
PERKINS COIE LLP P.O. BOX 2168 MENLO PARK, CA 94026			EXAMINER BOYCE, ANDRE D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3623	
DATE MAILED: 10/21/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/765,993

Applicant(s)

MADHAVAN, SURESH

Examiner

Andre Boyce

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-83 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-83 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Ch

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. This Final office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed August 1, 2005. Claims 1, 8, 23, 36, 45-66, 69, 71, and 76-80 have been amended. Claims 1-83 are pending.
2. The previously pending rejections to claims 36-66 and 76-80 under 35 USC § 101 have been withdrawn.
3. Applicant's arguments filed August 1, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
  
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claims 55 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 55 recites the limitation "the third." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1, 2, 8-12, 14-23, 27, 29, 31-35, 45, 46, 48-53, 57, 61-63, 69-71, and 73-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nummelin et al (USPN 6,308,164).

As per claim 1, Nummelin et al disclose a method to represent a project over a network (distributed project management system 100, figure 1), comprising: receiving a plurality of requirements for the project from at least one of a first plurality of computers connected to the network (i.e., project task and resource information input at project manager workstation 120, column 5, lines 65-67); transmitting the plurality of requirements to at least one of a second plurality of computers connected to the network (i.e., project resources receive task assignments at resource workstation 130, via enterprise network, column 5, lines 58-64); receiving a plurality of responses to the requirements from at least one of the second plurality of computers (i.e., receiving information from project resources regarding the status of project tasks, column 6, lines 37-39); and receiving at least one link between at least one of the plurality of responses and at least one of the plurality of requirements

from at least one of the second plurality of computers (i.e., resource used to complete the task and a task status), wherein the at least one of the plurality of responses facilitates further specifying an aspect of the at least one of the plurality of requirements (i.e., a project manager who is also a project resource, wherein the project manager can modify projects, tasks, and resources, column 6, lines 8-11 and 18-20).

As per claim 2, Nummelin et al disclose transmitting the plurality of requirements, the plurality of responses, and the at least one link to at least one of the first plurality of computers (update of the primary database 112, via the enterprise network and transfer of data between workstations 120 and 130, column 6, lines 31-34 and 50-53):

As per claim 8, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the requirements and the responses includes at least one of: a standard (e.g., skill required for the task, column 9, lines 15-17), a specification, and a datasheet.

As per claim 9, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the requirements and the responses includes at least one of: an input to the at least one of the requirement and the responses, and an output from the at least one of the requirements and the responses (e.g., resource as input and task completion as output).

As per claim 10, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the requirements and the responses includes at least one subject matter of the at least one of the requirements and the responses (e.g., creation of the task, including time duration and sequence, column 9, lines 11-14).

As per claim 11, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the requirements and the responses includes a security level that determines which users may view the at least one of the requirements and the responses (i.e., access level of the user at a workstation, wherein project managers may input project task and resource information, column 6, lines 7-11).

As per claim 12, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the requirements and the responses includes identifications of users that may (1) add, delete, and edit information included in the at least one of the requirements and the responses, and (2) add, delete, and edit at least one child requirement or response to the at least one of the requirements and the responses and information included in the child requirement or response (i.e., access level of the user at a workstation, wherein a project resource would not be given access to project manager functions, column 6, lines 7-11).

As per claim 14, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the requirements and the responses includes at least one of a labor cost (i.e., resource cost, column 9, lines 22-24), a material cost, and a duration.

As per claim 15, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the requirements and the responses includes at least a description of the requirement (task requirement).

As per claim 16, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the requirements and the responses includes at least a document relevant to the requirement (e.g., documents used as secondary information, column 10, lines 52-55).

Art Unit: 3623

As per claim 17, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the requirements and the responses includes a task of the project (column 9, lines 9-11).

As per claim 18, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the requirements and the responses includes a milestone of the project (e.g., task phase, column 9, lines 15-17).

As per claim 19, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the requirements and the responses includes a specification of the project (e.g., name and clients for the project, column 9, lines 2-8).

As per claim 20, Nummelin et al disclose the specification includes at least one of: a technical specification, a contract (e.g., client designators/codes including billing codes, column 10, lines 37-40), and a business rule.

As per claim 21, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the requirements and the responses includes at least one of a deliverable item and a procured item for the project (i.e., resource for the task includes equipment, column 6, lines 43-49).

As per claim 22, Nummelin et al disclose the first plurality of computers include the second plurality of computers (i.e., workstation 140 functioning as either a project manager workstation or resource workstation, column 6, lines 5-7).

Claims 23, 27, 29, and 31-35 are rejected based upon the rejection of claims 1, 9, 12, and 17-21, respectively, since they are the computer storage medium claims corresponding to the method claims.

As per claim 45, Nummelin et al disclose a method for structuring a project, comprising: receiving one or more elements of a project from a first party (i.e.,

project task and resource information input at project manager workstation 120, column 5, lines 65-67), receiving a selection of an element of a project from a second party (task creation); receiving a message concerning the selected element from the second party (input of project, project tasks, and resources information, column 5, lines 65-67); and saving in a database table a record including (1) the message, (2) an identification of the message as a first key to the record, and (3) an identification of the selected element as a second key to the record (input project information saved in database 112, column 5, lines 55-58).

As per claim 46, Nummelin et al disclose the first record further includes (1) an identification of another message being responded to, if any, and (2) an identification of a third party to receive the message (i.e., identification of task status and task resource).

As per claim 48, Nummelin et al disclose detecting the presence of the third party; and transmitting the message to the third party (resource workstation 130).

As per claim 49, Nummelin et al disclose loading information related to the selected element into memory database 112).

As per claim 50, Nummelin et al disclose sending an email to the second party to notify the receipt of the message (column 6, lines 53-56).

As per claim 51, Nummelin et al disclose saving in the database table a security level for the selected element that determines which parties may view the selected element received from the second party (i.e., access level of the user at a



workstation, wherein project managers may input project task and resource information, column 6, lines 7-11).

As per claim 52, Nummelin et al disclose saving in the database table an identification of an individual that may (1) add, delete, and edit information included in the selected element, and (2) add, delete, and edit a child element to the selected element and information included in the child element, received from the second party (i.e., access level of the user at a workstation, wherein a project resource would not be given access to project manager functions, column 6, lines 7-11).

As per claim 53, Nummelin et al disclose saving in the database table data contained in a datasheet of an item related to the selected element received from the second party (e.g., resource creation related to the task stored in database 112).

As per claim 57, Nummelin et al disclose method for representing a project, comprising: receiving a selection of an element of a project from a first party (task creation); receiving messages in a conference concerning the selected element from one or more parties (e.g., e-mail messages transferred between workstations 120 and 130, column 6, lines 50-55); and saving in a database table a record including (1) the messages, (2) an identification of the conference as a first key to the record, and (3) an identification of the selected element as a second key to the record (database 112).

As per claim 61, Nummelin et al disclose saving in the database table a security level for the selected element that determines which parties may view the selected

element (i.e., access level of the user at a workstation, wherein project managers may input project task and resource information, column 6, lines 7-11).

As per claim 62, Nummelin et al disclose saving in the database table an identification of an individual that may (1) add, delete, and edit information included in the selected element, and (2) add, delete, and edit a child element to the selected element and information included in the child element (i.e., access level of the user at a workstation, wherein a project resource would not be given access to project manager functions, column 6, lines 7-11).

As per claim 63, Nummelin et al disclose saving in the database table data contained in a datasheet of an item related to the selected element (e.g., resource creation related to the task stored in database 112).

Claim 69 is rejected based upon the rejection of claims 57, 61, and 62, since it is the computer storage medium claim corresponding to the method claims.

As per claim 70, Nummelin et al disclose encoded with a fourth field comprising a level of responsibility of the individual (i.e., access level of the user at a workstation, wherein a project resource would not be given access to project manager functions, column 6, lines 7-11).

Claim 71 is rejected based upon the rejection of claim 57, since it is the computer storage medium claim corresponding to the method claim.

As per claim 73, Nummelin et al disclose the message includes emails (column 6, lines 53-56).

As per claim 74, Nummelin et al disclose a third field of an identification of another message being responded to, if any (e.g., task resource).

As per claim 75, Nummelin et al disclose a third field of an identification of a party to receive the message (e.g., task resource).

As per claim 76, Nummelin et al disclose method comprising receiving from a user a linkage between a response and a requirement, wherein said requirement includes an element of a project to be implemented and said response includes a proposal to implement the requirement (e.g., project manager 120 inputs project task to be completed, wherein project resource 130 receives task assignment receipt by project resource 130).

As per claim 77, Nummelin et al disclose receiving from said user said response (e.g., resource responding to task requirement).

As per claim 78, Nummelin et al disclose receiving from said user said requirement (e.g., project manager inputting resource information).

As per claim 79, Nummelin et al disclose each of said responses and requirement includes a human language description of a vision of said project (e.g., project definition 320, figure 3).

As per claim 80, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of said requirement and said response includes at least one of: a labor cost (i.e., resource cost), a material cost, and a duration.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 3-7, 24-26, 28, 36-44, 47, and 58-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nummelin et al, in view of Formenti (USPN 6,487,469).

As per claims 3-5, Nummelin et al does not explicitly disclose the plurality of requirements is organized as nodes in a first hierarchical tree structure and the plurality of responses is organized as nodes in a second hierarchical tree structure, the first hierarchical tree structure is defined by at least one of a first plurality of users using at least one of the first plurality of computers, and the second hierarchical tree structure is defined by at least one of a second plurality of users using at least one of the second plurality of computers. Formenti discloses a scheduling application that enables a project manager the capability of arranging project tasks and sub-tasks in a hierarchical structure linking the relationships between the tasks in a tree structure (column 4, lines 27-31). Both Nummelin et al and Formenti are concerned with effective management. Further, Formenti discloses schedule database 30 using Microsoft Project (column 4, lines 23-26), as also disclosed by Nummelin et al, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the plurality of requirements organized as nodes in a first hierarchical tree structure and

the plurality of responses is organized as nodes in a second hierarchical tree structure in Nummelin et al, as seen in Formenti, thus providing an efficient means of organizing the tasks and resources.

As per claim 6, Nummelin et al disclose each of the first plurality of users is assigned a security level that determines if the user may view, edit, or delete a node and information included therein (i.e., access level of the user at a workstation, wherein project managers may input project task and resource information, column 6, lines 7-11).

As per claim 7, Nummelin et al disclose each of the first plurality of users is assigned to at least one node so the user may (1) add, delete, and edit information included in the at least one node, and (2) add, delete, and edit at least one child node to the at least one node and information included in the at least one child node (i.e., access level of the user at a workstation, wherein project managers may input project task, sub-task, and resource information, column 6, lines 7-11).

Claims 24-26 and 28 are rejected based upon the rejection of claims 3-5 and 6, respectively, since they are the computer storage medium claims corresponding to the method claims.

Claims 36 and 37 are rejected based upon the rejection of claim 3, since they are the user interface claims, corresponding to the method claim.

As per claim 38, Nummelin et al disclose a status of compliance between the third list and the linked at least one requirement (e.g., task status and progress towards completion, column 6, lines 39-41).

As per claim 39, Nummelin et al disclose a description of the at least one response in the third list (e.g., task description, including sequence relationship, column 9, lines 11-14).

As per claim 40, Nummelin et al disclose the link between the at least one response and the at least one requirement indicates that the at least one response is directed to meet the at least one requirement (e.g., resource created to complete task).

As per claim 41, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the requirements and responses is a task (column 9, lines 9-11), a milestone, a component specification, a deliverable, or a procurement.

As per claim 42, Nummelin et al disclose a graphical representation of a link between at least one requirement from the first list and at least one response from the second list linked (e.g., spreadsheet used as secondary information fields and values, column 10, lines 52-55).

As per claim 43, Nummelin et al disclose a security level required for a user to view, edit, or delete one of the requirements and the responses and information therein (i.e., access level of the user at a workstation, wherein project managers may input project task and resource information, column 6, lines 7-11).

As per claim 44, Nummelin et al disclose a user assigned to (1) add, delete, and edit information included in the at least one of the requirements and the responses, and (2) add, delete, and edit at least one child requirement or response to the at least one of the requirements and the responses and information included the at

Art Unit: 3623

least child requirement or response (i.e., access level of the user at a workstation, wherein project managers may input project task, sub-task and resource information, column 6, lines 7-11).

As per claim 47, Nummelin et al disclose detecting the presence of the third party (e.g., resource workstation 130). Nummelin et al does not explicitly disclose transmitting a hierarchical tree of the project to the third party, wherein the selected element is distinguished by one or more visual cues including underscore, color, and shading. Formenti discloses a scheduling application that enables a project manager the capability of arranging project tasks and sub-tasks in a hierarchical structure linking the relationships between the tasks in a tree structure (column 4, lines 27-31). Further, Microsoft Project including underscoring, shading and/or coloring. Both Nummelin et al and Formenti are concerned with effective management. Further, Formenti discloses schedule database 30 using Microsoft Project (column 4, lines 23-26), as also disclosed by Nummelin et al, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include transmitting a hierarchical tree of the project to the second party, wherein the selected element is distinguished by one or more visual cues including underscore, color, and shading in Nummelin et al, as seen in Formenti, thus providing an efficient means of organizing the tasks and resources.

As per claim 58, Nummelin et al disclose receiving a selection of the conference by a party (e.g., e-mail messages transferred between workstations 120 and 130, column 6, lines 50-55). Nummelin et al does not explicitly disclose transmitting a

Art Unit: 3623

hierarchical tree of the project to the party, wherein the selected element is distinguished by one or more visual cues including underscore, color, and shading. Formenti discloses a scheduling application that enables a project manager the capability of arranging project tasks and sub-tasks in a hierarchical structure linking the relationships between the tasks in a tree structure (column 4, lines 27-31). Further, Microsoft Project including underscoring, shading and/or coloring. Both Nummelin et al and Formenti are concerned with effective management. Further, Formenti discloses schedule database 30 using Microsoft Project (column 4, lines 23-26), as also disclosed by Nummelin et al, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include transmitting a hierarchical tree of the project to the second party, wherein the selected element is distinguished by one or more visual cues including underscore, color, and shading in Nummelin et al, as seen in Formenti, thus providing an efficient means of organizing the tasks and resources.

As per claim 59, Nummelin et al disclose transmitting the message to the second party (e-mail message to resource workstation 130).

As per claim 60, Nummelin et al disclose loading information related to the selected element into memory (database 112).

10. Claims 13, 30, 54-56, 64-66, 67, 68, 81, and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nummelin et al, in view of Desjardins (US 2002/0059512).



As per claim 13, Nummelin et al does not disclose at least one of the requirements and the responses includes at least one of: a description of at least one risk, a description of at least one mitigation, and a link between at least one risk and at least one mitigation. Desjardins discloses defining the basic feature of a project, including a risk analysis, which includes documenting the constraints and assumptions involved in the project (§ 0050). Both Nummelin et al and Desjardins are concerned with effective project management, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include risk analysis in Nummelin et al, as seen in Desjardins, thereby further defining the features of the project, thus making Nummelin et al more flexible and robust.

Claim 30 is rejected based upon the rejection of claim 13, since it is the computer storage medium claims corresponding to the method claims.

As per claims 54-56, Nummelin et al does not disclose saving in the database table an identification of a risk received from the second party, saving in the database table an identification of a mitigation received from a third party, and saving in the database table a link between the risk and the mitigation. Desjardins discloses defining the basic feature of a project, including a risk analysis, which includes documenting the constraints and assumptions involved in the project (§ 0050), and the system implemented using system 200, saving information in database 212 (§ 0130). Both Nummelin et al and Desjardins are concerned with effective project management, therefore it would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include risk analysis in Nummelin et al, as seen in Desjardins, thereby further defining the features of the project, thus making Nummelin et al more flexible and robust.

As per claims 64-66, Nummelin et al does not disclose saving in the database table an identification of a risk received from the first party, saving in the database table an identification of a mitigation received from a second party, and saving in the database table a link between the risk and the mitigation. Desjardins discloses defining the basic feature of a project, including a risk analysis, which includes documenting the constraints and assumptions involved in the project (§ 0050), and the system implemented using system 200, saving information in database 212 (§ 0130). Both Nummelin et al and Desjardins are concerned with effective project management, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include risk analysis in Nummelin et al, as seen in Desjardins, thereby further defining the features of the project, thus making Nummelin et al more flexible and robust.

Claim 67 is rejected based upon the rejection of claims 57 and 64-66, since it is the computer storage medium claim corresponding to the method claims.

As per claim 68, Nummelin et al does not disclose the first record further comprises a criticality level of the risk. Desjardins discloses defining the basic feature of a project, including a risk analysis, which includes documenting the constraints and assumptions involved in the project (§ 0050). Both Nummelin et al and Desjardins are concerned with effective project management, therefore it would

Art Unit: 3623

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include risk analysis in Nummelin et al, as seen in Desjardins, thereby further defining the features of the project, thus making Nummelin et al more flexible and robust.

Claims 81 and 82 are rejected based upon the rejection of claim 13, since they are the graphic user interface claims, corresponding to the method claim.

11. Claim 72 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nummelin et al.

As per claim 72, Nummelin et al does not explicitly disclose the message includes a content of an online conference. However, Nummelin et al disclose transferring data between workstations 120 and 130, including email messages transferred between workstations, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the message having content from an online conference in Nummelin et al, as an additional means of transferring information between workstations 120 and 130, thereby making the system more flexible.

12. Claim 83 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nummelin et al, in view of Desjardins, in further view of Formenti.

Claim 83 is rejected based upon the rejection of claim 3, since it is the graphic user interface claim, corresponding to the method claim.

***Response to Arguments***

13. In the Remarks, with respect to claims 1, 23, and 36, Applicant argues that Nummelin does not disclose specifying requirements using responses. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that Nummelin discloses a project manager who is also a project resource, wherein the project manager can modify projects, tasks, and resources (column 6, lines 8-11 and 18-20), as seen in the above rejection. As such, the project manager is able to respond to projects requirements by modifying the project, and/or its associated tasks and resources.

With respect to claim 45, Applicant argues that Nummelin does not teach receiving messages concerning elements of a project from a second party. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that the plurality of parties in Nummelin can be either a project manager or resource, wherein the project manager can function as both. As such, the project manner, as a second party, is able to send messages concerning elements of the project to other resources.

With respect to claims 57, 69, and 71, Applicant argues that there is no conferencing in Nummelin. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that transferring data between workstations is indeed an exchange of views (i.e., conference). Further, since a project manager can also function as a resource, as discussed above, the transferring of information via e-mail, is able to include modifications to the project.

With respect to claim 76, Applicant argues that Nummelin does not disclose a user providing a linkage between a response and a requirement. The Examiner

Art Unit: 3623

respectfully disagrees and submits that a project manager, functioning as a resource, is able to provide a linkage between a response and a requirement, by modifying a task and/or resource.

With respect to claim 8, Applicant argues that Nummelin does not appear to disclose responses including secondary information such as standards, specifications, or data sheets. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that a project manager, functioning as a resource, is able to enter both a requirement and a response.

With respect to claim 67, Applicant argues that neither Nummelin nor Desjardins disclose identification of a mitigation to the risk. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that Desjardins discloses finalizing a risk analysis, which may include documenting constraints and assumptions (§ 0050), thus identifying mitigation of a risk.

### ***Conclusion***

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and

Art Unit: 3623


any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andre Boyce whose telephone number is (571) 272-6726. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
adb  
October 15, 2005

  
TARIQ R. HAFIZ  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600